

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-4459**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

DARELL EUGENE JENKINS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., District Judge. (1:06-cr-00314-NCT)

---

Submitted: January 17, 2008

Decided: January 22, 2008

---

Before TRAXLER, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John D. Bryson, WYATT EARLY HARRIS WHEELER, LLP, High Point, North Carolina, for Appellant. Anna Mills Wagoner, United States Attorney; Lisa B. Boggs, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Darell Eugene Jenkins pled guilty pursuant to a written plea agreement to possession of a firearm by a felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1); 924(a)(2) (2000). Jenkins was sentenced to 54 months' imprisonment. Finding no error, we affirm.

On appeal, counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting there are no meritorious grounds for appeal, but questioning whether Jenkins' sentence is reasonable. Jenkins was notified of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but did not do so, and the Government elected not to file a responding brief.

Jenkins contends his sentence is unreasonable. However, the district court appropriately treated the Sentencing Guidelines as advisory, properly calculated and considered the advisory guideline range, and weighed the relevant 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (2000) factors. See United States v. Hughes, 401 F.3d 540, 546-47 (4th Cir. 2005). Jenkins' 54-month sentence, which is no greater than the applicable guideline range and below the statutory maximum, is therefore presumptively reasonable. See United States v. Green, 436 F.3d 449, 457 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 126 S. Ct. 2309 (2006); see also Rita v. United States, 127 S. Ct. 2456, 2462-65 (2007) (approving presumption of reasonableness accorded sentences within properly calculated guideline range).

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the conviction and sentence. This court requires that counsel inform his client, in writing, of his right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client requests that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move this court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on the client. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid in the decisional process.

AFFIRMED